

May 23, 1975

It is an unworkable suggestion with only one alternative. When a bill is vetoed by the Governor we either accept that veto or override. We cannot change it in any way at all. If we were to introduce a bill, or let's use the other term, even to gut a bill that is on Select File or General File you could not do that in the one day that's remaining. The only way it could be accomplished if this body were to give by a 40 vote, 40 out of our 49 or 4/5 vote, to extend our session I suppose indefinitely or maybe with a time limit I don't know. I'm sure this is an absolute impossibility. I think it's been made very clear here about the severability clause. Of course, there are those of us who believe a severability clause is perfect. There are some of us who feel that there are certain problems. I indicated earlier that it would be a 50-50 chance that it would stay there, or possibly a little bit better with a severability clause, if there is a constitutional problem. I believe that we should take this avenue of overriding the Governor's veto. It is important that we do this unless we want to be in special session because this is what the Governor was concerned about. This is what he talked about, when is a convenient time. I say there is no convenient time. My objections is strictly a personal thing against this. The Governor has nothing to do with the bill as far as I'm concerned. I've decided, under no authority of me being the Speaker or the leader, I just do this on my own. I am interested in not having a special session. There is a possibility, and I want to bring this out, that if this does go to court and the severability clause is not . . . does not protect us in this instance, at least there will be no special . . . there is no need for a special session in my mind at this time. It maybe sometime in September, October or November. This is the only thing I'm trying to explain to this body. This is probably the best solution.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Question of the Speaker relative to his letter which was not interjected earlier.

PRESIDENT: Yes, well he said he had talked to the Governor in response to a call. I think that matter was brought out by him in his opening statement.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Well he never indicated that he'd had . . . received a letter though.

PRESIDENT: I don't think that's a sufficient broadening of the issue to require additional comment.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Alright, he's also interjected the possibility that the Governor would call us anyway. I would like to explore that.

PRESIDENT: That was discussed in general debate. That's not new matter that would require additional comment from you.